



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,630	09/27/2006	Lori Henderson	10536.204-US	7222
25908 7590 03/06/2009 NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC. 500 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 1600 NEW YORK, NY 10110				
EXAMINER GOUGH, TIFFANY MAUREEN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1657				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/06/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/588,630

**Applicant(s)**

HENDERSON ET AL.

**Examiner**

TIFFANY M. GOUGH

**Art Unit**

1657

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 8, 11-15, 17, 20-22, 24-26, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38 and 40-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17, 20-22, 24-26, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40, 43, 44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 8, 11-15, 41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-846)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/4/06, 8/27/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

Election of claims 1, 4, 8, 11-15, 41, 42 was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 2/3/2009. Claims 1,4,8,11-15,17,20-22,24-26,31,33,34,37,38,40-44 are pending.

Claims 17,20-22,24-26,31,33,34,37,38,40,43,44 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention. Claims 2,3,5-7,9-10,16,18,19,23,27-30,32,35,36,39 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11-15, 41, 42 have been considered on the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "the fatty acid oxidizing enzyme" in claim 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no requirement of a fatty acid oxidizing enzyme in claim 14.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1,4,8,11-15,41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grichko (2004/0253696).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Grichko teaches a process for liquefying starch-containing material comprising treating with at least one alpha-amylase and a maltogenic amylase which has been reduced in size by milling. Grichko also teaches the liquefaction process to be carried out as a multi-step process within the temperature ranges of 80-105°C then 65-95°C and finally between 40-75°C. The starch material is also treated with an esterase such as lipase and phospholipase. The process is also carried out in the presence of a fatty acid oxidizing enzyme such as lipoxygenase (0008,0009,0012,0022,0023,0025,0039-0063,0085-0098,0109-0112).

Thus, the reference anticipates the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 12, 13, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by each of Veit et al. (WO 02/38787 A2) and Olsen et al. (WO 02/074895 A2).

Veit and Olsen teach a process for liquefying starch-containing material comprising treating with at least one alpha-amylase and a maltogenic amylase which has been reduced in size by milling. They also teaches the liquefaction process to be carried out as a multi-step process within the temperature ranges of 80-105°C then 65-95°C and finally between 40-75°C (see Veit p.3-6,p.9,lines 30-p.14 and Olsen p.4,lines 20-35, p.5, lines 1-9, p.12,lines 4-11,p.13, lines 28-p.14).

Thus, the reference anticipates the claimed subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11-15, 41, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of each of Veit et al. (WO 02/38787 A2) and Olsen et al. (WO 02/074895 A2) in view of Grichko (20040253696).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject

matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

As stated above, Veit and Olsen teach a process for liquefying starch-containing material comprising treating with at least one alpha-amylase and a maltogenic amylase which has been reduced in size by milling. They also teach the liquefaction process to be carried out as a multi-step process within the temperature ranges of 80-105°C then 65-95°C and finally between 40-75°C (see Veit p.3-6,p.9,lines 30-p.14 and Olsen p.4,lines 20-35, p.5, lines 1-9, p.12,lines 4-11,p.13, lines 28-p.14).

The above references do not teach using an esterase and a fatty acid oxidizing enzyme.

Grichko teaches a process for liquefying starch-containing material comprising treating with at least one alpha-amylase and a maltogenic amylase which has been reduced in size by milling. Grichko also teaches the liquefaction process to be carried out as a multi-step process within the temperature ranges of 80-105°C then 65-95°C and finally between 40-75°C. The starch material is also treated with an esterase such as lipase and phospholipase. The process is also carried out in the presence of a fatty

acid oxidizing enzyme such as lipoxxygenase (0008,0009,0012,0022,0023,0025,0039-0063,0085-0098,0109-0112).

At the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used such enzymes in a liquefaction process because they are known in the art to be used in such processes believed to add increased benefit. Grichko teaches a fatty acid oxidizing enzyme to be useful as it increases starch release and improves stability.

Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have used such enzymes with a reasonable expectation for successfully carrying out a liquefaction process such as those taught by Olsen and Viet because the enzymes are known in the art to have added benefits. For example, Grichko teaches a fatty acid oxidizing enzyme to be useful as it increases starch release and improves stability.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thornton*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).



A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1,4,11,12,14,15,42 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,2,5-8,15-17 of copending Application No. 10/459315. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims overlap in scope. Both sets of claims are drawn to a process involving liquefaction comprising an amylase, esterase and a fatty acid oxidizing enzyme. The claims of '315 differ in that they claim the addition of amylase, esterase and a fatty acid oxidizing enzyme in a fermentation step which is part of a LSF process.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Conclusion***

NO claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIFFANY M. GOUGH whose telephone number is (571)272-0697. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jon Weber can be reached on 571-272-0925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ralph Gitomer/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1657

/Tiffany M Gough/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1657